

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Interview held on October 18, 2005 and for indicating that the proposed amendments to claim 1 appear to overcome the art of record.

Claims 1-20 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 14, and 20 are amended as suggested by the Examiner. No new matter is introduced. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims in view of the above amendments and the remarks that follow are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

On page 2 the Office Action rejects claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) over U.S. Patent 6,785,728 to Schneider et al. (hereafter Schneider). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Schneider is directed to a method and system for distributed administration of access to information. In Schneider's method and system, *a user* of the GUI *selects* a user group. See column 23, lines 42-43. Therefore, as agreed upon during the Interview, Schneider does not disclose or suggest *dynamically* and *programmatically computing* the management functions of a target node list that contains nodes assessable to a user based on the roles assigned to the user, wherein management functions accessible to a first user is different from management functions accessible to a second user.

In contrast to Schneider, amended claim 1 recites: "if the user fails to specify a target node, dynamically computing the management functions of the target node list that contains expanded node groups and nodes that the user is able to access based on one or more roles assigned to the user, wherein management functions accessible to a first user is different from management functions accessible to a second user." As noted above, these features are not disclosed or suggested by Schneider. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-13 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite.

Regarding claim 14, for the same reason as noted above with respect to claim 1, Schneider does not disclose or suggest "if the user fails to specify a target node, a module for dynamically computing the management functions of the target node list that contains expanded node groups and nodes that the user is able to access based on one or more roles assigned to the user, wherein management functions accessible to a first user is different from

Appl. No. 09/852,894
Amdt. dated November 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 12, 2005

management functions accessible to a second user,” as recited in amended claim 14. Accordingly, amended claim 14 is allowable.

Claims 15-19 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 14 and for the additional features they recite.

Regarding claim 20, for the same reason as noted above with respect to claim 1, Schneider does not disclose or suggest “if the user fails to specify a target node, dynamically computing the management functions of the target node list that contains expanded node groups and nodes that the user is able to access based on one or more roles assigned to the user, wherein management functions accessible to a first user is different from management functions accessible to a second user,” as recited in amended claim 20. Accordingly, amended claim 20 is allowable.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Date: November 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Sean S. Wooden

Registration No. 43,997

Andrews Kurth LLP

1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.

Suite 300

Washington, DC 20006

Tel. (202) 662-2700

Fax (202) 662-2739